

3 1761 11554529 5

National Office
250C - 2nd Ave. S.
Saskatoon, Sask. S7K 2M1
(306) 652-9465



national farmers union

In Union is Strength

CA1

FN 100

- 1987

N/2

National Farmers Union

Submission

to the

Canadian Import Tribunal

on the subject of

Alleged Dumping of Solid Urea Imports

presented

in

Ottawa, Ontario

November 30, 1987

National Farmers Union
Submission
to the
Canadian Import Tribunal
on the subject of
Alleged Dumping of Solid Urea Imports
presented in

Ottawa, Ontario

November 30, 1987


We welcome the opportunity to present our views before this Tribunal on the subject at hand.

The National Farmers Union is a voluntary membership organization of farm families. We are non-commercial, non-partisan in politics and non-sectarian. Our membership support is based in the four western provinces, Ontario and the Maritime provinces. Currently we are comprised of about 8,000 farm families of which number approximately 25-30% reside east of the Manitoba/Ontario border. Many of our members are consumers of the product under investigation.

THE BASIS OF THE C-I-L COMPLAINT:

The purpose of this hearing is to further assess the legitimacy of a February 27, 1987 complaint filed by C-I-L Incorporated under the Special Import Measures Act. It alleges that the German Democratic Republic (G.D.R.) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.) have engaged in the dumping of solid urea in the Eastern Canadian market in the fertilizer year 1986. In a brief filed by C-I-L on October 23, 1987, it is submitted that "the dumping of solid urea from the G.D.R. and the U.S.S.R. has caused, is causing and is likely to cause material injury to C-I-L's production of like goods. The material injury suffered by C-I-L has been in the form of price erosion and price suppression with the resulting impact on margins and profits."

C-I-L alleges that in response to the imports of the subject goods, it took price actions which resulted in price injury, both in the agricultural market and in the industrial market for solid urea. Further, it reports that in November 1986, as a result of the low price of the subject imported goods, C-I-L itself purchased 22,000 tonnes of imported material believed to be of G.D.R. origin for resale in order



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115545295>

to maintain established accounts. This has been described as a "defensive measure". C-I-L does not report the price paid for the imported product but presumably was able at its blender price of \$182.00 per metric ton to earn a substantial profit.

C-I-L has since April, 1987, been the only producer of urea east of the Manitoba/Ontario border. Evidence further reveals that the annual production capacity of its Courtright, Ontario facilities is 157,000 metric tons. This represents 7% of total Canadian urea liquor production capacity and currently 100% of production capacity for Eastern Canada.

Production from this plant serves markets in both Central and Eastern Canada and the United States. Its 1986 annual report indicates that about one-half of its production is marketed in the U.S. C-I-L does not in its public evidence provide such additional relevant facts as:

- its actual production of urea in the 1986 and 1987 production years;
- a breakdown of its actual urea production volume that was marketed domestically and into export in each of these years;
- a comparison between its domestic sales price and its export price.

THE BASIS FOR THE CUSTOMS & EXCISE DEPARTMENT'S ASSESSMENT:

In its "Statement of Reasons" for initiation of an anti-dumping investigation respecting solid urea originating in or exported from the G.D.R. and the U.S.S.R., the Department of National Revenue Customs and Excise relies heavily on information provided by C-I-L in reaching its decision supporting C-I-L's dumping complaint.

C-I-L employs three different methodologies in support of its complaint.

In its first example, normal value of \$97.38 (U.S.) per metric ton is presented as a simple average of market prices for Western Europe for the period from October 1985 to December 1986. It suggests this normal value is low as the presence of G.D.R. and U.S.S.R. material may have had the effect of depressing prices in the

Western Europe market. E.E.C. producers are said to have filed a complaint with the Commission of the European Communities alleging that \$97.38 (U.S.) does not provide for all the costs of producing and marketing the product.

The second approach of C-I-L was to examine the "normal value" used by E.E.C. producers who estimated that total cost of production plus 7% for profits should return \$135.70 (U.S.) per metric ton. C-I-L did not agree this was an accurate price and suggested that E.E.C. producers underestimated the cost of natural gas and did not include any amount for general, selling and administrative expenses.

Within the period October 1985 to December 1986, C-I-L's average blender prices and list prices per metric ton were quoted in the D.N.R. Statement of Reasons to be (in Canadian dollars):

	<u>Blender Price</u>	<u>List Price (F.O.B. Courtright)</u>
October/85	\$ 235 (\$171.55 U.S.*)	\$ 244 (\$178.12)
January/86	235 (171.55)	215.50 (157.31)
April/86	229 (167.17)	220 (160.60)
July/86	213 (155.50)	232 (169.36)
October/86	203 (148.20)	197.50 (144.17)
December/86	190 (138.70)	182** (132.86)

* Approximate U.S. dollar equivalent based on \$1 Cdn = \$.73 U.S.

** Price quoted for January 1, 1987

C-I-L's third normal value example relied on information constructed by solid urea producers in the U.S. The price of \$216.41 (U.S.) per metric ton was said to include total manufacturing costs, general selling and administrative expenses and a profit of 8%.

Based on C-I-L's three options, the margin of dumping in each case was determined to be:

	<u>G.D.R.</u>	<u>Margin of Dumping</u> <u>U.S.S.R.</u>
a) Normal value @ \$97.38 (U.S.)	24.8%	0.7%
b) Normal value @ \$135.70 (U.S.)	46.0%	25.4%
c) Normal value @ \$216.41 (U.S.)	66.2%	53.2%

In the Statement of Reasons submitted to the Tribunal on August 27, 1987, over the signature of B. Brimble, A/Director General, Assessment Programs, the overall weighted average margin of dumping on the part of the G.D.R. is estimated at 66.47% on a volume of 126,760.58 metric tons imported into Canada during the period under review and 61.35% weighted average margin assessed against the U.S.S.R. on a volume of 103,119 metric tons.

On the basis of this assessment, it seems clear that Customs and Excise has accepted the U.S. costing figure of approximately \$216.41 (U.S.) per metric ton for urea as representing "normal value" in the period under investigation July 1, 1985 to May 31, 1987 and by so doing implies that countervail duties of a magnitude appropriate to establish such a price would be justified against G.D.R. and U.S.S.R. urea imports.

LOW PRICES - A GLOBAL PROBLEM:

It is not our purpose before this Tribunal to plead the cases of the G.D.R. and the U.S.S.R. This they presumably will do for themselves. Rather, it appears to us that the scope of the investigation conducted by Customs and Excise may have been so narrowly targeted against G.D.R. and U.S.S.R. imports and prices that it has overlooked the more global nature of the problem, including the generally depressed state of world grain prices confronting farmers.

We note that in its 1986 annual report presented to the Annual Meeting of Shareholders on April 24, 1987, C-I-L makes no reference to having encountered a dumping problem from the G.D.R., U.S.S.R. or any other country.

It refers to the acreage cutbacks in the U.S. and the subsequent decline in demand for fertilizer. It notes U.S. corn silos are full. It refers to problems encountered by higher prices for Canadian natural gas than prevailed in the U.S. and notes that through deregulation and lower rates for natural gas transportation costs, these problems are being met. It refers to market research to better evaluate future farm needs and concluded the manufacture of phosphate fertilizers at Lambton Works would not be competitive in future.

With respect to nitrogen fertilizers, C-I-L's 1986 report states:

"The prospects for nitrogen fertilizer producers look brighter. The world supply/demand ratio seems to be nearing a more even balance, and in addition, fewer plants are being built to supply the still growing demand. Equally important C-I-L is now among the world's lowest cost producers for its served market because of modern world-class plants, experienced and highly skilled staff, an established fertilizer wholesale and retail network, and an assured supply of natural gas.

"C-I-L, however, is taking nothing for granted. Money continues to be spent to ensure the ongoing efficiency of its manufacturing facilities. To improve distribution efficiency even further and reduce the dependence on cyclical markets, C-I-L is strengthening its fertilizer wholesale and retail network in the North American corn belt. It has also established an Agriculture Research Laboratory, and spread decision-making throughout the Agriculture organization to make it more responsive to customer needs and business conditions.

"Meanwhile, the fertilizer manufacturing business cycle continues, moving inevitably to better days. And as that happens, C-I-L is ready."

This does not present the image of a corporation facing serious danger of being forced out of the fertilizer business even though the alleged dumping of urea had already taken place for quite some time.

There is evidence which suggests C-I-L's action was more likely prompted by anti-dumping actions initiated in the U.S. and the European Community countries. A report found in the February 9, 1987 issue of "Green Markets", a McGraw-Hill Publication states in part:

"C-I-L, eastern Canada's largest fertilizer producer, is following the lead of US firms in the face of weak fertilizer markets. The company is considering seeking government action to curb urea imports and is streamlining its costs and operations to weather the market depression.

"An in-house team is studying the recent urea dumping suits in the US and the European Community with an eye toward mounting a similar campaign in Canada, Green Markets has learned. The countries to be targeted would include at least the three that US producers succeeded in getting preliminary bonds assessed against, the USSR, Romania and East Germany.

"Whether the scope of a Canadian complaint would be widened

to include other nations will depend in part on the team's consultations with its parent company in the UK, ICI.

"ICI is a member of the group of European producers that allege urea was dumped into EC nations by eight countries, a charge still being investigated within the EC. In December ICI was instrumental in getting quotas placed on East Bloc urea imports into Great Britain."

International market prices quoted for urea in the August 31, 1987 edition of Green Markets were as follows: (U.S. dollars per metric ton)

U.S. Gulf	\$ 95 - 100
Caribbean	85 - 90
W. Europe	90 - 93
E. Europe	80 - 90
Middle East	90 - 100

We are, however, not expected by C-I-L and Customs and Excise to regard imports from countries other than the G.D.R. and the U.S.S.R. to constitute dumping. Customs and Excise, in its Statement of Reasons dated May 29, 1987, rationalizes low prices on imports from other countries as follows:

"Based on the limited information available in respect to fertilizer year 1987, it is noted that prices from other countries which have continued to ship to Canada have decreased substantially. These countries were deemed by the complainant to be fair traders, because their prices to Canada were in the range of \$172.10 to \$188.40 in 1986. Although, their pricing to Canada appears to be very low (possibly at dumped prices) for 1987, it is believed that they have had to pursue this pricing practice in order to retain a portion of their sales to Canada and it is reasonable to conclude that, if measures are imposed on the G.D.R. and U.S.S.R. pricing to Canada, these countries will return to their practice of fairly pricing their goods shipped to Canada." (underlining ours)

This type of rationalization on the part of the Department appears to us as self-serving nonsense to justify its decision in targeting the G.D.R. and U.S.S.R. imports for countervail. It is pure speculation to assume, for example, that the U.S., given its record in dumping grain, would act differently in its fertilizer trade.

An Agriculture Canada publication, Market Commentary, December, 1986, featuring commentaries on farm inputs and finance,

reports a 10% decline in fertilizer use in the U.S. in 1986 and additionally states:

"The U.S. fertilizer industry suffered major reductions in its fertilizer exports in 1985-86, declining by 33% relative to the high levels established in 1984-85. Much of this decrease was due to the significant decline in total imports by such Asian markets as China and India. The decline in U.S. exports was particularly evident in urea and diammonium phosphate, both of which fell by almost 50%."

The above quotation from an article by E. Pidgeon, devoted to comment on the fertilizer situation, further observes that prices of virtually all fertilizer products declined on international markets in 1985-86, including nitrogen fertilizers which were at their lowest levels in 10 years with the U.S. Gulf anhydrous ammonia price of \$82/tonne being less than one-half of its average 1984 value. It predicted that price declines for nitrogen would probably be greater than those for phosphate or potash and adds:

"Price movements in 1987 will be strongly influenced by developments within the United States, as that country plays an exceedingly important role in the international fertilizer market."

On the matter of fertilizer prices in Canada for 1987, the article continues:

"Canadian fertilizer price movements in 1986-87 will be strongly influenced by prices on the international market, particularly by those in the United States. If the United States implements some form of restriction on its fertilizer imports, Canadian prices will probably be depressed in regions that can be easily supplied by other countries, as there will probably be considerable quantities of fertilizer available on the international market at very low prices."

As we now know, Canadian potash exports to the U.S. have been subjected to extremely high countervailing duties. The U.S. has also taken anti-dumping action against various urea producers and the U.K. has brought in a quota system on imports of Eastern Bloc product.

With the apparent depressed state of urea prices world-wide, which is not entirely unrelated to the depressed state of grain prices, we believe the countervail action proposed by the Department of National Revenue Customs and Excise is not really designed to correct the trading habits of two erring nations but more closely resembles an attempt to impose a trade embargo on urea against these two nations.

The real problem C-I-L has with low-priced urea imports is that it cannot currently produce urea in its plant at a profitable level. Under current market conditions, it would be much cheaper for it to import urea, at least in the short run, than it is to manufacture it.

We believe importers and brokers purchasing urea in currently depressed international markets are enjoying windfall profit margins. Urea prices paid by farmers have not similarly reflected the depressed state of urea prices.

Quarterly agricultural input prices assembled by the Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food for urea reports prices paid by farmers per tonne as follows:

1985				1986				1987	
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2
\$ 322	316	272	272	258	257	244	233	218	225

In fertilizer year 1985, the average value of urea imports was reported to be \$259.04/tonne. In 1986, the reported value was \$170.34/tonne and up to May 31, 1987, it was \$120.11/tonne, less than one-half the 1985 average price. Quite apparently the commercial marketing structure has been able to effectively administer domestic retail prices.

Preliminary statistics published by the Fertilizer Institute of Ontario and the Quebec Fertilizer Manufacturer's Association indicate that for the year ended June 30, 1987, Ontario consumption of urea was 177,514 tonnes and 87,967 tonnes in Quebec. Together, producers in these two provinces consumed 265,481 tonnes of urea in the 1986-87 year.

The Canadian Fertilizer Institute reports that urea shipments of domestic manufacture for the fertilizer year ended June 30, 1987, was as follows:

Ontario:	46,896 metric tonnes
Quebec:	9,065 metric tonnes
Atlantic:	502 metric tonnes

This indicates that approximately 26.4% of Ontario urea consumption was of domestic manufacture but only 10.3% of Quebec

consumption.

C-I-L has indicated its production capacity at its Courtright plant to be 157,000 metric tonnes. If the domestic shipments from domestic manufacture serve as any type of a guide, it appears the plant operated below capacity in fertilizer year 1987. Its annual report indicates that half of its production is shipped to the U.S. market. Granting C-I-L this countervail action would have the effect of holding Canadian farmers hostage to its corporate interests.

This countervail will not remedy the current depressed state of international urea prices. We suspect C-I-L is as much aware of this as anyone. A major result of a successful countervail will simply be to enlarge the urea market potential in Canada for other exporting countries, principally the U.S., whose market share here has been reduced from 59.2% in fertilizer year 1985 to about 30% in 1987.

Restoring the U.S. market share would probably be welcomed by C-I-L which reportedly has donated \$60,000 in support of the national business council free trade lobby. (Toronto Star, September 8, 1987) Considering the countervail action the U.S. has imposed upon Canadian potash exports, it would hardly seem that we owe the U.S. any charity on urea.

Quite apparently we are witnessing an international trade war in urea as we have witnessed in oil and are currently experiencing in grain. We believe there are also other considerations of importance to farmers which must be addressed in considering this application.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL GRAIN TRADE WAR:

A consequence of the international grain trade war has been the high subsidization of grain exports to importing countries by the U.S. and the E.E.C.. Canadian grain marketing agencies have had to meet these competitive prices in order to maintain our market shares. This has been extremely costly to farmers.

In the crop year, 1985-86, final realized wheat prices for prairie farmers were 14.1% below those realized in 1984-85. In 1986-87, initial wheat prices were reduced by 18.8% and for the 1987-88 crop

year initial prices were further reduced by 15.4%. Similar reductions were invoked upon Eastern Canadian producers.

Because grain prices are seriously depressed, producers do not welcome the move by C-I-L to attempt to maintain an artificially high price for fertilizer on our domestic market which will contribute even further to farm income costs and losses. Grain prices are now unable to return cash costs of production. Unlike U.S.-E.E.C. farmer competitors, Canadian grain producers do not receive guaranteed subsidized prices for their products. Levels of countervail upon fertilizer prices considered acceptable to C-I-L would render Canadian grain producers even less competitive in world grain markets than is presently the case.

Trade must be a two-way street. The U.S.S.R. is a major importer of Canadian grain. In the 1985-86 crop year, it imported 5,219,000 tonnes of Canadian wheat (Canadian Wheat Board, Annual Report, 1985-86 crop year). In the preceding three crop years, 1982-83 to 1984-85, it imported annual volumes averaging 6,580,000 tonnes, by far our largest customer. In addition, it is a major customer for Canadian barley. (See Appendix A) These large grain purchases have created a sizable imbalance in trade between our two countries. A countervailing duty or other equally repressive trade measure against U.S.S.R. urea imports could very easily trigger retaliatory action which would damage our current delicate trade relations with that country. The U.S. has aggressively been attempting to capture a larger share of the U.S.S.R. market through subsidized sales. A countervail against U.S.S.R. urea would only assist the U.S. in its grain trading piracy.

The G.D.R. is also a sizable importer of Canadian wheat and barley, although not to the extent of the U.S.S.R. In 1985-86, it imported 48,000 tonnes of wheat and 571,000 tonnes of barley, making it our second largest customer for barley. In the three previous crop years, it imported an annual average of 840,000 tonnes of barley and 184,000 tonnes of wheat.

It is important to the Canadian balance of trade that our grain trading relationships with these two nations not be placed in

jeopardy. The nation cannot afford it and farmers cannot afford it either.

For these several reasons, we strongly recommend that the countervail action initiated by C-I-L against urea imports from the G.D.R. and the U.S.S.R. be rejected.

All of Which is Respectfully
Submitted by:

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION



CANADIAN WHEAT (INCLUDING DURUM) EXPORTS BY AREAS AND COUNTRIES **CROP YEARS 1975-76 to 1984-85**

Country	1976-77 000 tonnes	1977-78 000 tonnes	1978-79 000 tonnes	1979-80 000 tonnes	1980-81 000 tonnes	1981-82 000 tonnes	1982-83 000 tonnes	1983-84 000 tonnes	1984-85 000 tonnes	1985-86 ^a 000 tonnes
WESTERN EUROPE:										
EEC:										
Belgium and Luxembourg	38	71	36	12	—	16	23	10	127	100
Denmark	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	1	1	1
France	30	81	62	4	12	88	107	199	104	58
Germany, Federal Republic	356	66	15	12	1	18	1	26	3	3
Ireland	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	1	—
Italy	546	894	544	723	765	515	624	742	240	367
Netherlands	197	221	62	70	22	38	17	103	107	78
Portugal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	149
United Kingdom	1 431	1 526	1 312	1 361	1 409	1 366	1 109	955	633	702
TOTAL EEC	2 598	2 859	2 032	2 183	2 209	2 042	1 881	2 037	1 216	1 458
OTHER WESTERN EUROPE:										
Finland	—	6	88	9	6	29	—	—	7	—
Norway	118	67	67	137	10	57	70	148	62	68
Portugal	—	57	39	43	17	—	—	—	—	—
Spain	—	26	54	—	51	—	—	—	—	—
Sweden	—	1	4	1	—	—	2	—	4	2
Switzerland	52	77	63	71	54	49	109	49	9	—
TOTAL OTHER WESTERN EUROPE:	170	234	315	261	138	135	181	197	82	70
EASTERN EUROPE:										
Bulgaria	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	216
Czechoslovakia	67	—	—	6	—	14	5	5	5	—
Germany, People's Rep. of	292	32	74	10	67	—	308	73	170	48
Poland	868	686	583	1 487	1 091	1 674	622	52	91	22
Romania	84	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
U.S.S.R.	1 043	2 146	1 429	2 579	3 971	5 019	6 959	6 761	6 019	5 219
Yugoslavia	130	88	—	127	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL EASTERN EUROPE:	2 484	2 952	2 086	4 209	5 129	6 707	7 894	6 891	6 285	5 505
TOTAL EUROPE:	5 252	6 045	4 433	6 653	7 476	8 884	9 956	9 125	7 583	7 033
AFRICA:										
Algeria	508	462	335	598	654	590	512	813	508	492
Benin	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chad	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	5	—
Ethiopia	—	86	15	51	81	45	92	49	128	93
Ghana	117	104	76	98	25	45	24	63	37	66
Ivory Coast	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—
Kenya	—	—	—	—	—	16	—	—	39	—
Libya	22	—	—	28	81	291	110	93	124	174
Mali	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	—	—	—
Mauritania	5	8	10	—	2	—	4	11	11	10
Morocco	88	275	100	129	12	15	—	—	—	—
Mozambique	32	11	11	—	5	16	25	14	21	7
Niger	—	—	—	—	—	2	4	—	2	—
Nigeria	23	3	20	28	—	—	21	66	—	133
Rwanda	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	14	—	—
Senegal	5	10	2	6	8	9	13	10	9	8
Somalia	10	—	—	—	—	7	—	—	—	—
South Africa	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	55
Sudan	1	—	—	7	—	—	—	2	4	5
Tanzania	24	34	38	—	10	13	—	13	10	—
Togo	6	5	3	8	—	—	21	23	7	8
Tunisia	47	41	73	49	23	10	—	—	—	—
Uganda	—	—	—	8	—	—	9	1	—	—
Upper Volta	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	2	—	—
Zaire	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Zambia	—	—	—	17	—	—	—	—	12	10
Zimbabwe	—	—	—	3	—	—	—	17	17	—
TOTAL AFRICA	888	1 039	685	1 031	901	1 060	852	1 198	934	1 061



Country	1976-77 000 tonnes	1977-78 000 tonnes	1978-79 000 tonnes	1979-80 000 tonnes	1980-81 000 tonnes	1981-82 000 tonnes	1982-83 000 tonnes	1983-84 000 tonnes	1984-85 ¹ 000 tonnes	1985-86 000 tonnes
MIDDLE EAST:										
Arab Rep. of Egypt	258	409	117	—	—	316	23	662	450	464
Cyprus	13	8	—	—	—	—	—	32	14	—
Iran	—	—	—	110	96	73	107	488	41	61
Iraq	209	233	102	428	453	258	280	608	367	347
Israel	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	18	99	25
Jordan	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lebanon	25	105	221	75	119	91	158	—	—	6
Saudi Arabia	—	—	—	—	—	—	26	—	—	—
Syria	84	281	—	20	—	—	242	260	529	—
Turkey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	89
Yemen, P.D.R.	2	8	1	—	6	—	24	—	108	—
TOTAL MIDDLE EAST:	592	1 045	441	633	674	738	860	2 068	1 608	992
ASIA:										
Afghanistan	7	34	13	21	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bangladesh	190	222	337	428	134	264	312	476	65	536
China, People's Rep. of	2 074	3 469	3 102	2 516	2 879	3 101	4 424	3 428	2 780	2 558
Hong Kong	34	30	34	37	16	9	6	13	13	9
India	79	—	—	—	40	91	7	513	5	—
Indonesia	148	—	—	24	—	32	224	201	200	333
Japan	1 246	1 419	1 226	1 336	1 381	1 367	1 341	1 325	1 323	1 272
Korea, Dem. People's Rep.	36	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Korea, South	29	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	472
Malaysia	7	3	20	10	10	—	5	—	72	9
Nepal	—	—	—	13	1	—	—	—	—	—
Pakistan	58	89	150	34	6	54	29	58	33	41
Philippines	363	—	—	27	—	—	—	—	—	21
Singapore	—	23	4	—	—	—	46	—	—	—
Sri Lanka	—	—	—	—	—	21	98	124	100	108
Taiwan	22	—	—	79	—	28	85	84	81	108
Viet-Nam	12	118	22	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL ASIA:	4 305	5 407	4 908	4 525	4 467	4 967	6 577	6 228	4 672	5 467
WESTERN HEMISPHERE:										
Barbados	—	1	4	4	—	5	—	2	—	—
Belize	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—
Bolivia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	—	—
Brazil	1 031	782	948	1 270	1 284	1 314	1 503	1 362	1 145	986
Chile	—	75	—	—	—	24	—	—	—	—
Colombia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	57
Costa Rica	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—
Cuba	339	496	523	866	656	730	878	772	598	1 029
Dominican Republic	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
El Salvador	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—
Haiti Republic	53	71	38	33	37	20	—	—	25	—
Honduras	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	1	4	4
Jamaica	23	30	51	62	45	31	29	22	24	39
Mexico	—	91	21	71	27	154	163	276	—	—
Nicaragua	—	—	—	—	—	18	—	48	—	—
Peru	62	78	124	48	—	8	—	49	26	47
St. Lucia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
St. Vincent	—	16	21	4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Trinidad & Tobago	85	60	87	8	—	—	—	—	—	—
Venezuela	44	—	15	4	—	15	—	69	294	320
United States	35	—	—	—	—	—	115	53	159	274
TOTAL WESTERN HEMISPHERE:	1 672	1 703	1 832	2 370	2 049	2 323	2 711	2 678	2 275	2 757
TOTAL BULK WHEAT:	12 709	15 239	12 299	15 212	15 567	17 972	20 956	21 283	17 071	17 310
BAGGED SEED WHEAT:	2	7	3	3	2	1	1	1	42	8
GRAND TOTAL:	12 711	15 246	12 302	15 215	15 569	17 973	20 957	21 284	17 073	17 318

¹ Subject to revision.

Source: Canadian Grain Commission "Canada Grain Exports" for 1985-86.

All previous years: Statistics Canada "Grain Trade of Canada".

CANADIAN BARLEY EXPORTS BY AREAS AND COUNTRIES
CROP YEARS 1976-77 to 1985-86

Country	1976-77 000 tonnes	1977-78 000 tonnes	1978-79 000 tonnes	1979-80 000 tonnes	1980-81 000 tonnes	1981-82 000 tonnes	1982-83 000 tonnes	1983-84 000 tonnes	1984-85 000 tonnes	1985-86 ¹ 000 tonnes
WESTERN EUROPE:										
EEC:										
Belgium and Luxembourg	119	94	—	—	—	121	481	708	—	—
Denmark	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
France	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	22	—	—
Germany, Federal Rep.	238	206	100	53	—	—	51	20	—	—
Greece	—	26	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Italy	851	630	425	582	344	417	310	126	—	—
Netherlands	155	31	—	—	1	—	—	63	—	—
Portugal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	58
United Kingdom	56	58	72	24	10	3	—	—	2	—
TOTAL EEC:	1 436	1 045	597	659	355	541	842	939	2	58
OTHER WESTERN EUROPE:										
Finland	—	—	—	—	—	111	—	—	—	—
Iceland	—	—	4	4	3	1	—	—	—	—
Malta	—	—	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	—
Portugal	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—
Spain	—	—	—	—	—	235	410	102	—	—
Switzerland	40	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL OTHER WESTERN EUROPE:	40	—	4	13	3	347	410	107	—	—
EASTERN EUROPE:										
Bulgaria	—	—	31	—	—	—	—	—	—	180
Germany, People's Republic of	282	—	246	—	—	103	600	1 123	798	571
Hungary	—	—	32	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Poland	150	595	570	383	147	—	—	105	—	—
Romania	—	15	226	—	—	—	—	67	—	87
U.S.S.R.	121	166	126	872	1 573	2 780	1 526	472	410	439
TOTAL EASTERN EUROPE:	553	776	1 231	1 255	1 720	2 883	2 126	1 767	1 208	1 277
TOTAL EUROPE:	2 029	1 821	1 832	1 927	2 078	3 771	3 378	2 813	1 210	1 335
AFRICA:										
Algeria	78	109	80	138	—	36	—	—	—	—
Libya	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Morocco	—	21	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—
Tunisia	—	—	21	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
TOTAL AFRICA:	87	130	101	138	—	40	—	—	—	—
MIDDLE EAST:										
Cyprus	—	20	63	93	—	45	61	58	—	—
Iran	177	184	154	23	—	80	92	209	—	—
Iraq	46	—	16	59	—	—	101	197	135	—
Israel	132	116	235	239	124	209	252	256	187	145
Jordan	—	—	—	23	—	—	8	—	—	—
Kuwait	—	—	—	32	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lebanon	18	9	15	43	—	15	—	—	—	—
Saudi Arabia	—	—	—	57	—	89	—	31	—	899
Syria	—	—	—	103	—	—	—	98	—	—
Turkey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	188	—	—
TOTAL MIDDLE EAST:	373	329	483	672	124	438	514	1 037	322	1 044
ASIA:										
China, People's Republic of	—	—	—	—	—	77	83	26	—	213
Japan	862	841	873	789	805	914	970	820	735	839
Korea, South	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—
Singapore	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	262	140	—
Taiwan	—	—	—	—	—	118	83	—	—	—
TOTAL ASIA:	862	841	873	789	805	1 109	1 136	1 113	875	1 052
WESTERN HEMISPHERE:										
Colombia	56	72	78	91	47	86	101	115	—	—
Cuba	33	38	31	47	60	53	42	40	36	43
Ecuador	—	—	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mexico	—	—	—	—	—	—	22	63	83	22
Peru	—	19	9	29	11	23	16	13	—	—
United States	168	99	140	138	111	202	121	74	78	96
TOTAL WESTERN HEMISPHERE:	257	228	265	305	229	364	302	305	197	161
TOTAL BARLEY:	3 608	3 349	3 554	3 831	3 236	5 722	5 330	5 268	2 604	3 592
MALT (Barley Equivalent):	174	191	246	254	285	280	318	269	177	203
GRAND TOTAL:	3 782	3 540	3 800	4 085	3 521	6 002	5 648	5 537	2 781	3 795

¹ Subject to revision.

Source: Canadian Grain Commission "Canada Grain Exports" for 1985-86.
All previous years — Statistics Canada "Grain Trade of Canada".

